

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRAVADO INTERNATIONAL GROUP
MERCHANDISING SERVICES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOES 1-100, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-00524-JSW](#)

**NOTICE OF QUESTIONS FOR
HEARING**

Re: Dkt. No. 5

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE
OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS FOR THE HEARING SCHEDULED ON FEBRUARY 19,
2016 AT 9:00 A.M.

The parties shall not file written responses to this Notice of Questions for hearing.

If the parties intend to rely on legal authorities not cited in their briefs, they are ORDERED
to notify the Court and opposing counsel of these authorities reasonably in advance of the hearing
and to make copies of those authorities available at the hearing. If the parties submit such
additional authorities, they are ORDERED to submit the citations to the authorities only, without
argument or additional briefing. *Cf.* N.D. Civil Local Rule 7-3(d). The parties will be given the
opportunity at oral argument to explain their reliance on such authority.

1. The date of the February 6, 2016 Metallica concert at AT&T Park has passed.
What occurred at that concert and in the surrounding area pursuant to the Court's February 3, 2016
temporary restraining order ("TRO") and seizure order?

a. What, if anything, was seized pursuant to this Court's order?

b. How many Defendants were served with the papers in this action? What
papers were they served with in person? Has any follow-up service or other communication

1 occurred?

2 2. Have all Defendants have properly been served with the Complaint and notice of
3 this hearing, or should additional process be required before the Court may proceed with this case?

4 3. The Court's February 3, 2016 order set a deadline of February 12, 2016 for written
5 responses to the motion for preliminary injunction. No Defendant has filed a written response. Is
6 Plaintiff now aware of the identity of any Defendant? Should the Complaint be amended to name
7 the Defendants?


8 4. The Court's February 3, 2016 seizure order terminated, on its own terms, six hours
9 after the February 6, 2016 Metallica concert at AT&T Park. The Court's TRO and Plaintiff's
10 request for a preliminary injunction appear to be moot now that the concert is over. Should the
11 TRO be dissolved and the request for preliminary injunction be denied as moot? If not, why not?

12 5. What should now be done with regard to any seized property?

13 6. What additional relief, if any, does Plaintiff seek in this action? What,
14 procedurally, are the next steps for the Court and the parties?

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: February 16, 2016

17
18 
19 _____
20 JEFFREY S. WHITE
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28